

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

DECEMBER, 1928.

No. 12.

Full Forgiveness.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part V.
(Concluded.)

And did not Peter say in the Apostles' Council that he believed that he should be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ? Acts 15, 11. This statement strikes the Socinians so hard that in their catechism ¹⁾ they deem it necessary to use fully a page and a half endeavoring to refute it. The passage, says the catechism, reads thus: "Now, therefore, why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." Acts 15, 10, 11. And then the catechism explains that the pronoun *they* refers to the Gentiles. To whom? To the Gentiles? Why, the apostle had just spoken of the "fathers." V. 10. Besides, in the original text the pronoun *they* ²⁾ is masculine, like "the fathers," but the noun *Gentiles* ³⁾ is neuter gender. Now, nobody refers a masculine pronoun to a neuter noun without urgent reason, especially if a masculine noun is much closer. Besides, the entire argument of St. Peter would be perverted in a most ridiculous manner if we would explain it according to the Racow Catechism. The manner of the justification of the Gentiles was under discussion in the Apostles' Council at Jerusalem. Acts 15. Some had asserted that faith alone was not sufficient, but that the Gentiles must also be placed under the Law. Acts 15, 5. And now imagine, Peter arises and proves — what? Not the justification of the Gentiles by the justification of the apostles, but the justification of the apostles

1) *Catechismus Racoviensis*. [*Catechesis Ecclesiarum Polonicarum*, published in Polish 1605, in Latin 1609. Racow (or Rakow), a small town in Russian Poland, was the center of the Polish Socinians at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. See *Concordia Cyclopaedia* sub "Socinianism" and "Socinians." — *The Translator*.]

2) Ἐκεῖνοι . . . πατέρες, vv. 11, 10.

3) τὰ ἔθνη, v. 7.

by the justification of the Gentiles? ⁴⁾ Wonderful logic, indeed! But is it not rather this way, that Peter wishes to establish that the Gentiles can be saved without the Law? He uses two arguments to prove this. First, he shows that the Gentiles have already received the Holy Ghost, Acts 15, 8. 9; secondly, that even the fathers, who were under the Law, were not saved by the Law. Acts 15, 10. 11. For it would certainly be the height of folly arbitrarily to impose a law upon the Gentiles which did not even save those to whom God had given it. "Then all the multitude kept silence," we read Acts 15, 12; and that was proper, for this argument was irrefutable, and therefore a resolution based on it was passed. Acts 15, 22—29. This very plainly is what Acts 15, 11 teaches. Also the Apology of the Augsburg Confession found this to be the meaning of this passage (*Triglotta*, p. 137); and since the days of Augustine it has often been stated and demonstrated with strong proofs. In addition, Acts 10, 43 Peter declares the same thing, by saying that "*all the prophets* give witness to Him [Christ], that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." And Rom. 3, 21 Paul says that the imputed righteousness of Christ is "witnessed by the Law and the prophets." ⁵⁾ This testimony gave to Old Testament believers the assurance of forgiveness of sins. Therefore the Lord said to the Jews: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life." John 5, 39. And they verily would have had it if they had only been willing to see that the Scriptures testify of Christ. Therefore Paul writes of the Scriptures of the Old Testament to Timothy that they are able to make him "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. 3, 15.

But putting all this aside, what will those people who incline towards Socinianism do with 1 Cor. 10, 4 and Heb. 11, 26? 1 Cor. 10, 1. 4 we read: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud . . . and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." What did they drink? Of the rock? But no rock followed them. And what is more, the apostle is not at all speaking of a material, but of a spiritual rock. "And that Rock was

4) The formula καθ' ὃν τρόπον reasons from a known (κακῆσιν) factor to one which is still in controversy. 2 Tim. 3, 9; Acts 10, 47; 11, 17; 15, 8.

5) What sense would there otherwise be in the statement Heb. 11, 7, where Noah is called an "heir of the righteousness which is by faith"?

Christ." So, according to the clear words of the text, the Israelites in the desert drank Christ.⁶⁾ John 4, 14, compared with chap. 6, 35, shows what this means, namely, that they apprehended the merit of Christ by faith. Therefore the saints in the Old Covenant had the same fountain of grace and the same way of drawing from it as we have. Heb. 11, 24—26 is still stronger: "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; *esteeming the reproach of Christ greater than the treasures in Egypt.*" Pray, what will people who banish Christ the Lord from the Old Testament do with this passage?⁷⁾ Either the apostle speaks nonsense, — which God forbid! — or his meaning is this: The reproach of Christ is that reproach which Christ suffers. But Christ suffers in His members. Christ calls from heaven: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *Me*?" Acts 9, 4. And yet Saul had persecuted the Christians. So it is as clear as day that also in the days of Moses, Christ was being persecuted in His members. If it had been his own reproach or only the reproach of his people which Moses chose, God would not have rewarded him for it. But because all reproach which Israel suffered in Egypt was meant for Christ and therefore was really and literally the reproach of Christ, it is said: "Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward."⁸⁾ Heb. 11, 26. And this recompense of reward he received abundantly; for he was with Christ on the Mount of Transfiguration (Luke 9, 30) and (v. 31) spoke with Him "of His decease which He [Christ] should accomplish at Jerusalem." Thus he suffered

6) Christ is compared to a rock for several reasons. *Est metaphora in subjecto (petra). Non enim loquitur de petra naturali, sed spirituali et de hac praedicat, quod sit Christus. Patet hoc etiam ex altero, quod de illa petra praedicatur, quod nimirum Israelitas secuta fuerit in deserto. Non enim petra illa materialis secuta fuit. (Balduin.)*

7) The apostle does not say: "Moses esteemed such a reproach as later on Christ among others suffered greater riches than the treasures in Egypt," but τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "*the reproach of Christ.*" He knows but one reproach.

8) [Ὁ ὀνειδισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ] "*est afflictio, quae infligitur intuitu et odio fidei in Christum. Fideles itaque sub veteri testamento etiam in Christum crediderunt. Vocatur istud opprobrium Christi, non tantum ideo, quia ecclesia patitur propter Christum, set etiam, quia Christus suum facit, sicut, e. g., Act. IX, 4: 'Saul, Saul, quid me persequeris?'*" (Seb. Schmidt, *Com. in Ep. ad Hebraeos*, p. 1244.)

with Christ and was glorified with Him. Rom. 8, 17. Or in what other way was he made so blessed and so glorious, blessed and glorious long before the death of Christ on the cross? Was it for the sake of his works? Moses? That Moses who was punished for his unbelief, not being permitted, on account of it, to enter Canaan? Num. 20, 12; 27, 12—14; Deut. 34, 4. 5. No, Moses was blessed and glorified for no other reason than for Christ's sake. Who will dare deny this of a man who according to the express testimony of Scriptures suffered the reproach of Christ and tasted the glory of Christ? God says Rom. 8, 30: "Whom He justified, them He also glorified." Now He did glorify Moses, glorified him already before the death of Christ. Hence it follows that He truly justified him, justified him already before the death of Christ. Will you *still* say that the doctrine that the blood of Christ was efficacious before He shed it is an invention of the theologians?

And what sort of logic is it to assert that there indeed was forgiveness in the Old Testament, but not for Christ's sake? If God forgave Abraham and David without the intervention of the sacrifice of Christ, then He can forgive everybody without the intervention of Christ's sacrifice. There we have the dear old "Father of All" [*Allvater*] of the Rationalists, who connives at sin. Our God does not forgive without the shedding of blood. Heb. 9, 22. But since the blood of bulls and of goats does not take away sins, Heb. 10, 4, therefore, whenever God in the Old Testament forgave but one single sin, He forgave for the sake of the blood of Christ. Our opponents say: If God regarded Abraham as perfectly righteous for Christ's sake, then the death of Christ was superfluous. Exactly the reverse is true: If the justice of God permitted the granting of the very least forgiveness without regard to the death of Christ, then God could have dispensed with the death of Christ altogether. The only reason why Christ died was that the justice of God did *not* permit such forgiveness. The retroactive power of the blood of Christ is most clearly seen in those instances where He forgave sins before He died upon the cross. Did He not say to the man sick of the palsy: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee," Matt. 9, 2, and to the woman who was a sinner, Luke 7, 48. 50: "Thy sins are forgiven. . . . Go in peace"? We know very well by whose power this was done, but the question is for whose sake it was done. Did not Christ here publicly anticipate the fruit of His bitter death? Or if it was sufficient for forgiveness that He merely came and forgave, why, then, did He die? Now, just as He, in view of the shedding of His blood on the cross,

absolved the man sick of the palsy and the great sinner, just so and just as fully did He, in view of the shedding of His blood, regard Abraham and David righteous. Not this is an invention of the theologians, that the blood of Christ had retroactive power, but this, that forgiveness was ever granted without the blood of Christ. Let us, therefore, avoid such Socinian doctrine and abide in singleness of heart by the Word of God, and let us do this the more cheerfully because we know that Melancthon and Luther and the dear Fathers constantly confessed this doctrine. The Apology says: "The promise of Christ who was to come was transmitted from one patriarch to the other, and they knew and believed that God through the blessed Seed, through Christ, wished to give blessing, grace, salvation, and consolation. Therefore, since they understood that Christ would be the treasure by which our sins should be paid, they knew that our works could not pay such a great debt. Therefore they received forgiveness of sin, grace, and salvation without any merit and were saved through faith in the divine promise, the Gospel of Christ, just as the saints in the New Testament." (*Trigl.*, 136 [German text]; comp. also p. 265.) And in another place: "Of this the idle Sophists know little; and the blessed Gospel, which proclaims the forgiveness of sins through the blessed Seed, that is, Christ, has from the beginning of the world been the greatest consolation and treasure to all the pious kings, all prophets, all believers. For they believed in the same Christ in whom we believe; for from the beginning of the world no saint has been saved in any other way than through faith in the same Gospel. For Peter clearly cites the consensus of the prophets, and the writings of the apostles testify that they believe the same thing." (*Trigl.*, 273.) And again: "For also the patriarchs and saints in the Old Testament became righteous and were reconciled to God through faith in Christ who was to come, through whom salvation and grace was promised, just as we in the New Testament receive grace through faith in Christ who has been made manifest. For from the beginning all believers believed that an offering and payment for sin would be made, namely, Christ, who was promised, as Isaiah (53, 10) says: 'When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin.'" (*Trigl.* 402, German text.) Luther teaches exactly the same. He declares: "The forgiveness of sins has been *the same* at all times. Christ is *the same* yesterday and to-day and forever. Therefore they [David and the patriarchs] were saved through faith in Christ, who was to come; but we receive forgiveness of sins and eternal life through faith

in the Lord Christ who has already been given unto us, who died for us, and is now sitting in His glory." (St. Louis Ed., V, 553.) And in another place: "[Forgiveness] was purchased once on the cross, but the distribution takes place often, before and afterwards, from the beginning of the world to the end. For since He [Christ] resolved to procure it, it was indifferent to Him whether He, through His Word, distribute it before or afterwards." (St. Louis Ed., XX, 275.) In his sermon on Gen. 3, 14. 15 Luther uses still stronger language: "Here it is written that Adam was a Christian long before the birth of Christ. For he had the same faith in Christ that we have. For in matters of faith, time makes no difference. Faith is of the same nature from the beginning to the end of the world. Therefore he [Adam], through his faith, received the same that I receive. He did not see Christ with his eyes, neither did we, but he had Him in the Word; so we also have Him in the Word. The only difference is this: at that time it *was to come* to pass, now it *has come* to pass. Accordingly all the Fathers were justified in the same manner as we through the Word and through faith, and in this faith they also died." (St. Louis Ed., III, 85.)

Must we cite still more testimonies, for instance, the testimony of Clement of Rome, the pupil of Paul, or of Augustine or of Chemnitz and Gerhard? We could present a long array of witnesses to the reader, and Spener would not even be the last one of them. At the same time we by no means deny the difference between the two Testaments, but we confess on the basis of Col. 2, 16. 17:⁹⁾ We have the body of Christ; this the Old Testament believers did not have, not to speak of other very considerable advantages of the New Covenant.¹⁰⁾

Many passages, moreover, testify that the forgiveness which for Christ's sake was dispensed in the Old Covenant was perfect. Or does it sound like fractional forgiveness when Isaiah rejoices: "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for He hath clothed me with the robe of righteousness"? Is. 61, 10. And why does David pray: "Forgive *all* my sins"? Ps. 25, 18. And again: "Deliver me from *all* my transgressions"? Ps. 39, 8. And how can the Korahites pray: "Thou hast forgiven

9) Not Χριστός, but τοῦ Χριστοῦ, that means: τὸ δὲ σῶμα σκιᾶς σῶμα Χριστοῦ.

10) Catholicity of salvation, much more abundant and more extended outpouring of the Spirit, miracle-working gifts, clearer knowledge of many heavenly things, freedom from the Ceremonial Law.

the iniquity of Thy people, Thou hast covered *all* their sin. Thou hast taken away *all* Thy wrath: Thou hast turned Thyself from the fierceness of Thine anger"? Ps. 85, 2. 3. And David: "Bless the Lord, O my soul, . . . who forgiveth *all* thine iniquities"? Ps. 103, 3. And King Hezekiah, speaking of the past: "Behold, for peace I had great bitterness; but Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; *for Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back*"? Is. 38, 17. And does not Ezekiel say: "If the wicked turn from his sin, . . . *none of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him*"? Ezek. 33, 16. And Hosea: "Take with you words and turn to the Lord; say unto Him, Take away *all* iniquity and receive us graciously"? Hos. 14, 2.¹¹⁾ Is it possible to designate full forgiveness with clearer words? Or if the ever-recurring "all, all, all," according to laws of speech unknown to us, designates an incomplete justification, what terms should the Holy Spirit have used to designate to us a complete justification? Furthermore, these texts are not sufficiently explained by saying that one may possess forgiveness and still be very much in need of it. For if that means that one may in the same moment have and not have forgiveness of sins, then this is clearly false. Here is Hezekiah, who says that absolutely all his sins are forgiven. Now, if some one comes with the assertion that *all* in this place means as much as *not all*, then this is not merely a twisting of words, but is doing open violence to the words of Scripture. If, however, one wishes to say that one may be in possession of full forgiveness and yet, after two hours, be very much in need of it, then this is not only correct, but a necessary complement to the doctrine of full forgiveness. For God's forgiveness does not belong to any one like a house or a gold coin, but like a cloak — you must hold it fast. However, he who is in possession of it at this or any other moment has it entirely — Luther, and St. Paul, and Hezekiah, and Abraham, but no one in a higher degree than the other one.

It is, indeed, peculiar that the very people who assert that affliction is in proportion to sin deny the full forgiveness in the Old Covenant. They say that we have no full forgiveness because we must die, for death is a sign of incomplete forgiveness. And what about Enoch and Elijah? According to these people they possessed much less forgiveness than we. And yet they did not taste of death! Only one of the two propositions can be correct:

11) Not to mention Jer. 33, 8; Micah 7, 18—20; Ps. 130, 8.

either affliction is in proportion to wrath, and then Elijah obtained not only full, but superabundant forgiveness, or Elijah possessed a fractional forgiveness, and then the alleged connection between wrath and affliction is broken. I confess that I cannot understand how a person who is imperfectly justified can bodily be taken up in heaven. On a chariot of fire he is carried into the bosom of God, in a glorified form he appears on the Mount of Transfiguration in communion with the Lord, long before the crucifixion of Christ, — and yet he is said not to have had full forgiveness!

Finally, as regards the alleged connection between affliction and chastisement, such connection is present in one sense — through sin death came into the world. Rom. 5, 12. God threatened the first man: "In the day that thou eatest thereof [of the forbidden tree], thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2, 17. He ate, and the wrath of God burst upon him — "thorns and thistles," Gen. 3, 18, "in the sweat of thy face," Gen. 3, 19, "thou shalt return unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken," Gen. 3, 19. This wrath, however, has been perfectly appeased through the blood of Christ, Rom. 3, 25; John 2, 2; Heb. 2, 17, at least for those who lay hold of this blood by faith, John 3, 36. Therefore all the affliction that God sends upon the believers flows from love. "For whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons." Heb. 12, 3—8. And Titus 2, 11, 12 the apostle says that not the wrath, but the grace of God teacheth [Luther: *zuechtigt*] us. Therefore Scripture carefully distinguishes between punishment¹²⁾ and chastening.¹³⁾ "Therefore it should be diligently impressed upon the minds of the afflicted who are thus chastened that God is *not angry with them* and that they should consider their present visitation a sure sign that God has received them into His grace." (Luther, St. Louis Ed., II, 1466.) However, the purpose of such chastening is not to procure a higher degree of forgiveness for the afflicted, but to keep them in humility. 2 Cor. 12, 7. 9. (Luther. St. Louis Ed., XVI, 7849; II, 1748.)

12) *Τιμωρία*, Heb. 10, 29; *κόλασις*, Matt. 25, 46.

13) *Παιδεία*, 2 Tim. 3, 16 (instruction); Heb. 12, 5. 7. 8. 11 (chastening).

The only text which seems to conflict with this is 1 Pet. 4, 17: "For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God?" The Greek word which Luther [and the Authorized Version] translates with "judgment" simply means "judgment which has separation for its purpose."¹⁴ Now, what does God separate? Of course, sin, from which He himself is far removed. That this judgment operates in different ways is the fault of men. Whoever lets go of his sin when God plucks it out of his hands will be saved; whoever fervently clings to it will be cast into the fire along with it. If you consider sin, then the affliction of the justified is the same as that of the enemies of God — judgment; if, however, you consider the persons who are visited by affliction, then you will find wrath in the case of one and grace in the case of the other. That this is so is shown by death. Death, viewed *per se*, is the wages of sin, but for the person who is visited by death it is neither a sign of justification nor of condemnation. To him who dies in Christ, death is grace, for it removes him out of thousand troubles and brings him into the heavenly fatherland. If, on the other hand, one dies in enmity with God, to him death is an earnest of damnation and a gate to hell. Hence the secure must be told that their affliction is a prelude to the torments of hell; for if they will not let go of sin, God casts them into the lake of fire. On the other hand, the penitent must be told that God indeed hates *sin*, but that He loves *them* and that, therefore, they should patiently submit to the treatment of their faithful Physician, and they will surely be made whole. (Luther. St. Louis Ed., II, 1467 f.) Whoever studies the divine message to the Seven Churches in Asia Minor in the Revelation of John in the light of this doctrine, will not be put to shame. True, God says: "I have somewhat against thee; repent." Rev. 2, 4. 5. 14. 16. This He must say, for also in those who are justified there still is sin. If God does not remove *that*, it will grow and become dominant. Now, when God says: "I have somewhat against thee," He does not mean: You are not yet fully blessed, — for we *are* blessed in Christ, Eph. 1, 6, — but He means: Under the garment of the righteousness of Christ which you are

14) *Koiva*, from *κοίνω*. This meaning fits in all the 28 texts in which it occurs in Scripture. Of course, the meaning is qualified according to the context. In Matt. 7, 2 and Rev. 20, 4 it is a judicial sentence of separation spoken by men; Rom. 2, 3 and Gal. 5, 10 it is God's own sentence of separation on Judgment Day.

wearing there still is sin. Free yourself from it, else I must free you from it; for sin easily gains the upper hand, and then it will tear your garment. So the words "I have somewhat against thee" prove the imperfection of the righteousness of life and not that of the righteousness of faith.

In no respect whatever is there an immediate relation between affliction and our justification in the sight of God. If by all means you would like to have a connecting medium, let it be this, that God through affliction leads man to repentance, and repentance is the soil of faith. And *in this way* God endeavors to keep us from falling from justification. (Apology. *Trigl.*, 299 f.) So, then, if God sends us affliction, we will penitently submit ourselves to Him; we will let go of all things which are not wholly pleasing to Him. From our afflictions we at all times should be willing to learn to know the imperfection of our righteousness of life; for if no sin adhered to us, God would not chasten us. But we will not permit any one to perforate the garment of the righteousness of Christ which God has given unto us. For among the thousands of imperfect possessions on this earth it is the only perfect one. And on the perfection of this possession all our comfort is based. It was only because Paul could begin his hymn of victory with the words: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," Rom. 8, 1, that he could close with the words: "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord." Rom. 8, 38. 39.

Are the Beatitudes Law or Gospel?

The Sermon on the Mount, of which the Beatitudes are a part, is without doubt the most widely known discourse of Jesus. And not only is it better known than many other parts of the Bible, but it has also been, and still is, much admired. Even many who lay claim to no deep religious conviction have spoken of it in terms of highest praise. Aye, there have actually been those who wished to take this sermon and discard all the rest of the Bible. But it certainly is not in accordance with the will of Him who has given *all* Scripture that we should be so impressed with the beauty of a small part of it as to neglect all the rest. We are not to tear a few leaves out of the Bible and run away with them. "*All Scrip-*

ture is given by inspiration of God and *is profitable*." Just as our body requires a variety of food, — no man can live on his favorite dish alone, — just so our soul should have well-balanced rations and should be allowed to enjoy the variety which God has provided.

But it does remain true that some parts of Scripture are far more important than others. The fifteenth chapter of Luke is more important for us to-day than the sixth chapter of First Chronicles, and the third chapter of Romans is far more valuable to the Church than the register of the genealogy found in the seventh chapter of Nehemiah. Even so, after all is said, it remains true that the Sermon on the Mount is an exceedingly precious gem of the entire Bible. Faithful teachers of the Church have recognized this and have devoted some of their best efforts to pointing out the rich treasures of this incomparable sermon of our divine Master. Luther devoted an entire series of sermons to these chapters of St. Matthew and expresses his gratification at the publication of just these sermons of his.¹⁾ In the introduction to these sermons he forewarns all not to allow false teachers to pervert for them the precious words of the Sermon on the Mount. Romanists have led the way in corrupting these chapters by their doctrine of "evangelical counsels." That error has been abundantly refuted.²⁾ Then there are many who insist that the explanation of the Moral Law which Jesus gives in this sermon is a brief summary and the very essence of all His teachings. That makes of Jesus a second Moses, a mere preacher of God's Law, and robs Him of His Gospel glory. Such teaching takes from the Christian the most precious treasure of all, the best that Jesus taught. It is true, Jesus also taught the Law. But while the Law was given by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

However, even among faithful and orthodox teachers of Biblical truth there has not been an entire agreement on the question whether the Sermon on the Mount contains any Gospel at all. Some have insisted that this entire discourse of our Savior cannot be understood unless we constantly keep in mind that it is all Law and nothing but Law and that there is not one word of Gospel in it. Those who have defended this view seem to have felt that they ought to refute the false teachers who taught that, when Jesus in this sermon explains the spirituality of the Law, He shows us how we are to become His followers and how we are to obtain

1) St. Louis Ed., VII, 346.

2) Walther, *Gesetz und Evangelium*, p. 79 sq.

eternal life. In order to refute such false doctrine, faithful teachers have said: In this sermon Jesus is not teaching His people how to obtain forgiveness of sin and how to become partakers of God's grace, but here, in this place, Jesus is telling *those who are Christians* how they ought to live. He is teaching them a righteousness of life which is in every way superior to the righteousness which His disciples saw the Pharisees and Sadducees and scribes practise. And it is certainly true that much of this sermon is Law. Even when in the 20th verse of the fifth chapter He declares: "I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven," He teaches the pure Law of the New Testament and condemns the righteousness of the Pharisee as no righteousness at all, because there was in their righteousness no true love of God, no true trust in God, no true fear of God; for all that these scribes and Pharisees did was done from pride and in order to be seen of men and to obtain praise from men,³⁾ whereas God wants childlike trust, fear, and love in the heart. He wants spiritual righteousness, which seeks God's glory and our neighbor's welfare.

But after we have admitted this, must we not ask again, Did Jesus actually preach an entire sermon without one word of Gospel? Is there in this whole Sermon on the Mount no word of consolation, no word of comfort, for those in distress? Did Jesus in this entire sermon do no more than explain the Law of Moses, the Moral Law? Faithful teachers of our Church have denied this and have pointed out that in this sermon also Jesus comforts with sweet words those who are troubled because of their sin, because of persecution, because of tribulations. Luther, for instance, in commenting upon the first words of this Sermon on the Mount, declares: "That is a fine, sweet, friendly beginning of His teaching and preaching; for He does not tear along like Moses or a teacher of the Law, commanding, threatening, and frightening, but in a most friendly manner He utters cheering promises, which beckon and invite."⁴⁾ And again, later on, he writes: "How friendly, how sweet is this sermon for the Christians who are His disciples!"⁵⁾

If Luther was right in asserting of these Beatitudes that they are "sweet" and "friendly," "comforting" and "consoling," then he certainly does not agree with those who insist that they are Law,

3) Matt. 23, 5—7; John 5, 44.

4) St. Louis Ed., VII, 355.

5) *Ib.*, 356.

threatening punishment and condemning the transgressors of the Law.

The writer of this article agrees with Luther that these Beatitudes are precious, friendly, consoling, and comforting words of the Lord Jesus, and therefore Gospel.⁶⁾

There are two reasons for taking this position. First, all the arguments which are urged in favor of thinking that the Beatitudes are Law fail to convince; and secondly, there are good and irrefutable reasons for confidently believing that the Beatitudes are Gospel. Let us first examine the arguments that have been mentioned in support of the view that this first part of the Sermon on the Mount is also Law.

One argument which has been urged for this view is the following: "If all the other statements of the Sermon on the Mount are Law and not Gospel, then the Beatitudes also, which are a part of this sermon, must be Law and not Gospel." Where is the logician that would approve such logic? Need we do more than state the argument? It refutes itself. What preacher would allow any one to argue thus concerning a sermon of his: A part of your sermon was Law, consequently it must all have been Law.

Then one has said that in Luke 6 there is a parallel passage of the record of these chapters of Matthew and that this parallel is Law and that therefore also the record of Matthew must be Law. But this again is merely an *argumentum in circulo*; for it is stating as a fact that which is to be proved, namely, that the Beatitudes in Luke are Law and not Gospel. We do not deny that in Luke 6 there is Law, even as a part of this sermon as Matthew reports it is Law, but we claim that the Beatitudes which are found in Luke 6 are Gospel, even as here. Read again Luke 6, 20—23 and tell me, Is Jesus there not comforting His disciples with consoling and sweet words?

Still another argument has been advanced. It has been said that in v. 17 of Matt. 5 there is mentioned the occasion which moved Jesus to preach this whole sermon, namely, to show that it would be a misunderstanding of His teaching of the Law if one maintained that He had come to destroy the Law and the prophets, for He had not come to destroy, but to fulfil the Law and the prophets, and that therefore, because Jesus wanted to explain His attitude to the Law, the entire sermon on the Mount must be Law and

6) Calov, in his *Biblia Illustrata*, writes: "*Christus hic non moraliū doctorem agit, cum beatitudinem explicat, sed evangelicæ beatitudinis veram rationem tradit.*"

not Gospel. But again we fail to see the cogency of the argument. Could not Jesus do what Paul did — show that the preaching of the Gospel does not make void the Law? Does not Paul in Rom. 3—5 preach the Gospel, and does he not then turn to show that by such Gospel-preaching he is not making void the Law?

Again, it has been argued that the very words of the Beatitudes show that they are Law and not Gospel, since Jesus in them does not teach the unconverted how they are to become disciples and to receive forgiveness of sin, but that He is showing the converted how to live a life truly pleasing to God. But those who urge this fail to distinguish between the Beatitudes and the other part of this Sermon on the Mount. Above all, however, they overlook the key-word of the Beatitude: *μακάριοι*, *beati*, blessed. That is the word which has given them their name, *Beatitudes*.

But in order to refute this position, we must now discuss thetically the true meaning and content of these Beatitudes.

By way of introduction we would remind the reader that there are two ways of preaching the Gospel: one is to tell man of forgiveness of sin through Christ's blood and then to invite him to accept this precious gift; the other is to assure a Christian that he has, and even now possesses, the forgiveness of his sin. We practise both of these in our churches. We proclaim to the masses that God's favor is not to be obtained by our own works, we tell them of all that Christ did for us, that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin, and we invite them to believe this and to rejoice in the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world. That is Gospel-preaching. But we also tell the Christians that *they are even now in possession of the forgiveness of their sins and of the grace of God*, that they have eternal life and are the beloved children of God. *That is also Gospel*. When Christians confess their sins and ask God to have mercy upon them for Jesus' sake, we grant them absolution. That is Gospel. That is nothing but the sweetest Gospel. And that is exactly what Jesus is preaching here when He says to His disciples, "Blessed are ye."⁷ He pronounces to them the absolution of God, He opens the door of

7) Although Jesus in these first Beatitudes in Matthew does not say, *μακάριοι ἐστε*, but *μακάριοι οἱ*, yet later on, v. 11, He does say, "Blessed are ye," *μακάριοι ἐστε*. And in Luke 20 He expressly uses the second person, saying *μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν κτλ*. This shows that in the Beatitudes He was directly addressing His disciples, believers, and assuring them of the grace of God, with all that this grace includes. This could never have been done on the basis of the Law, for these believers whom He was addressing had not fulfilled the Law of God.

heaven, He assures them that they have forgiveness, that they are in possession of God's grace, and that heaven is awaiting them. That one word *μακάριοι* is God's absolution, it makes every one of these Beatitudes such an absolution, and therefore the Beatitudes are Gospel-preaching. An absolution based upon a partial fulfilment of the Law is false and wicked, and an absolution based upon the perfect fulfilment of the Law carries no comfort to sinful men. The only absolution that can console sinful men is an entirely unconditional absolution.

But does not Jesus here call those blessed who do His will and are His obedient disciples? Does He not base their blessedness upon their poverty of spirit, their meekness, their patience? Consider the following:—

When our pastors grant absolution, they also speak words which have seemed to some to involve certain conditions; for our pastors pronounce absolution to those only who confess that they repent of their sins, believe in Jesus Christ, and sincerely purpose, by the assistance of God the Holy Ghost, henceforth to amend their sinful lives. By requesting such a confession from those to whom they wish to pronounce forgiveness, they do not make the absolution conditional, but they describe the spiritual condition of those who accept the grace of God. All men who do not repent of their sins, who do not believe in Christ, who have not the earnest purpose of amending their lives, — all such do not and cannot accept forgiveness of sins; for remission of sins can be accepted by true faith alone. Therefore, although the forgiveness of sins has also been gained for the unbeliever and is also in general offered even to unbelievers, it is not, and cannot be, accepted by those who remain in unbelief. Just as the best food may be offered to one who cannot and will not swallow, and even may be urged upon him, yet if he does not take and swallow it, he does not receive the benefit of it. The offer of the food is not made conditional upon his swallowing, — it is made without any condition whatsoever, — but if he does not take it and ingest it, he will not receive any benefit from it; in fact, he does not accept it. The words, therefore, which to some seem to be a condition of the absolution which our pastors offer, are in reality a description of the one who actually does accept the forgiveness. All this holds good of the absolution granted in these Beatitudes. Jesus, in the second part of every Beatitude, does not state the condition upon which He pronounces the "*Blessed*," but He *describes those* who have the grace and blessing of God through faith. The first part of each Beatitude

is an absolution. The second part is a description of the person who has received and enjoys this absolution.

As to the first of these two statements, no one can deny that the word *μακάριοι*, as used by Jesus in this place, secures to those who are so addressed all the blessings of the Gospel and all the wondrous, rich temporal and eternal fruits of this Gospel. By this word *blessed* Jesus bestows upon every one of whom it is affirmed the grace and mercy of God and all that is included in God's favor, of which St. Paul writes: "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" Rom. 8, 32.

But now as to the second part. Is the second part of each one of these Beatitudes actually a description of those who receive this absolution and possess it? Let us see.

In the first Beatitude the blessed are described as "poor in spirit." Is that not a description of a penitent sinner? Is that not the very same thing to which our pastors refer when before pronouncing absolution they ask, Do you heartily repent of your sins? In the second one they are described as "they that mourn." Is that not a description of a true Christian? No one can accept forgiveness but they who are of a contrite heart, who *mourn* over their sins. In the next verse they are described as "meek." That is the description of the Christian who has surrendered himself to God, who knows that he dare not come before God with any claim, but must cast himself upon God's mercy, praying God to be merciful to him, a sinner. In the sixth verse they are described as "those who hunger and thirst after righteousness." This has often been restricted to a hunger and thirst after one's own personal righteousness, but why restrict it so? The text does not force us to do it. Those who hunger and thirst after righteousness are those who wish to be righteous in the sight of God and also truly righteous in themselves, and this is the hunger and thirst which we find in all Christians. They long for forgiveness, and they long for sanctification. These two need not be separated. In the fifth and sixth petitions of the Lord's Prayer they are united. These two petitions show that this twofold hunger and thirst are inseparably joined in the Christian. No Christian on earth dare stop praying the Fifth Petition, nor dare he omit the Sixth Petition.⁸⁾

8) Calov prefers to restrict this hunger and thirst to the desire for forgiveness: "*commodissime intelligitur imputata justitia.*" Bengel, in his *Gnomon*, writes of this hunger and thirst: "*Qui sentiunt, se per se non habere justitiam, qua se Deo hominibusque probent, eamque vehementer desiderant.*"

The seventh verse describes the *blessed* as "merciful." This represents the Christian as he prays the Fifth Petition of the Lord's Prayer, asking for forgiveness and willing to forgive his neighbor. One who has obtained mercy is also merciful. We also do not pronounce absolution to one who will not forgive his neighbor. If this seems to some to be going too far, let such a one remember Ps. 32, 2: "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity and in whose spirit there is no guile." Is this Law, or is it Gospel? Is not this phrase, "in whose spirit there is no guile," a description of the recipient of God's absolution? And if it is, why not apply the same method of interpretation to these Beatitudes?

In the following verse Christians are described as "pure in heart." Is it right to exclude from this the purification wrought by the blood of Jesus Christ? If it referred to the pure in heart who, in their own character, are pure from all sin, then this eighth verse would certainly not be a friendly, kind, merciful teaching, such as Luther declares Christ to be giving His disciples in these Beatitudes, but would be the pronouncement of the curse eternal upon all mankind; for who can say that he is pure in his heart? Who will find a clean one among the unclean? Prov. 20, 29; Job 14, 4.⁹⁾ This eighth verse of Matt. 5 is certainly not to be placed on a parallel with that answer of the Lord's to the lawyer to whom Jesus said: "This do, and thou shalt live," and "Go and do likewise." Luke 19, 28. 37. Here, in these Beatitudes, Jesus is not dealing with the proud Pharisees, but is comforting His believers. He calls them blessed people, because, though their sins were as crimson, they are now as wool. Is. 1, 18. In the ninth verse the Christians are described as "peacemakers." That is just another part of their quality of being merciful. They have made peace with God and daily make their peace with God, and so they also make peace with their fellow-men. This is a fruit of their faith, a fruit which begins to show itself as soon as they have accepted the peace of God through Jesus Christ. In the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth verses of this chapter He pronounces them blessed because they are persecuted for righteousness' sake, and He tells them that this will happen to all His believers. Who would call this rich comfort a part of the Law? ¹⁰⁾ It is one common

9) Calov writes: "*Nulla est cordis purificatio sine fide. NAM PER FIDEM PURIFICANTUR CORDA NOSTRA. Act. XV, 9.*"

10) Quenstedt asks: "*Quis unquam credit afflictiones, quas patimur ab alio, esse nostra bona opera?*" (*Loc. de Bon. Op., sect. II. XVII.*)

experience which all believers must undergo — they are all persecuted. To comfort such persecuted Christians and to assure them of God's mercy and grace is certainly not the province of the Law, but of the Gospel.

Nor is this manner of pronouncing absolution restricted to the Beatitudes. St. Paul pronounces the same kind of absolution to believers when he writes: "And in nothing terrified by your adversaries; which is to them an evident token of perdition, but to you of salvation, and that of God." Phil. 1, 28. He tells them that the persecution by adversaries is to be a token to the Christian of his salvation. When a Christian is persecuted for righteousness' sake, he is to hear Jesus Himself pronouncing to him the absolution of the Beatitudes.

In Ps. 32 we read: "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity and in whose spirit there is no guile." This is certainly Gospel, and yet here also he is assured of forgiveness "in whose spirit there is no guile." This additional description of the recipient of grace does not change these comforting words from Gospel into Law. Indeed, David, in the Psalms, frequently calls upon God to be merciful to him and requests absolution, urging his faith and its fruit, imperfect though it be, *as a mark* of one who accepts God's mercy and appreciates it. David says, Ps. 86, 1, 2: "Bow down Thine ear, O Lord, hear me; for I am poor and needy. Preserve my soul; for I am holy (חַסִּיד). O Thou, my God, save Thy servant that trusteth in Thee." In this 86th Psalm, David is not asking for mercy on the basis of his own personal, perfect obedience of the Law, but he is asking for mercy as a child of God, who, with a penitent and believing heart, accepts, and is ever ready to accept, God's forgiveness and grace. There are many more such prayers of David in the Psalms. Ps. 26, 1—3; 7, 8; 18, 20. Even in Ps. 51, where David certainly confesses his sin with great contrition and humility, he urges upon God the broken spirit and the broken and contrite heart, which are the sacrifices which God will not despise. Just so Elizabeth calls the Virgin Mary blessed. "And blessed is she that believed." Luke 1, 45. In these words Mary is not assured of God's blessing upon the basis of perfect obedience, but she is described as a believer. In the Magnificat, v. 50, Mary declares: "And His mercy is on them that fear Him from generation to generation." Here also she pronounces all those blessed and possessors of God's mercy who fear the Lord. She certainly does not mean all those who perfectly

obey the First Commandment; she is rather describing those who accept God's mercy.

Holy Scripture is full of such Gospel assurances in which the recipient is described. All of these are not Law, but Gospel. Whoever teaches that they are Law robs the Christian of much of the sweetest Gospel comfort.

We know that it has also been said that these Beatitudes are neither Law nor Gospel, but merely descriptive portions of Holy Writ. He who claims this must, in order to be consistent, declare that such words of Jesus as Luke 6, 24—26 are neither Law nor Gospel, but merely description. We never heard of one who would do that. When Jesus pronounces a curse, He is not only uttering a description, but such a curse is Law; and when He pronounces one blessed and a child of God and in possession of God's grace, He is not only giving a description, but He is also bestowing God's grace, mercy, and forgiveness. Jesus does not only show us a picture; He actually bestows upon us that which His words express.

No, we are not forced to say that Jesus preached His longest sermon without one word of Gospel. Nor shall we admit that He comforted His disciples with the Law; for these Beatitudes are what Luther designates them, "sweet, consoling words." S.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

A Historical Convention.—When the Joint Synod of Ohio held its recent biennial meeting, resolutions were adopted which are of unique interest and will go down in history as marking an epoch in the development of Lutheranism in America. The one pertained to the merger with the Iowa and Buffalo synods, which was endorsed and will be consummated as soon as certain technical details have been adjusted. The Iowa Synod had adopted a declaration on the doctrine of inspiration (see last issue of THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY) which was considered satisfactory and removed the obstacle to union which quite unexpectedly had arisen two years ago. The other resolution is to the effect that pulpit- and altar-fellowship shall exist between the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America (Merger) and the Ohio Synod. The various Districts of the Ohio Synod had voted in favor of such a mutual recognition, and the Norwegian body had passed a similar resolution a year ago. By establishing fraternal relations with the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, the Ohio Synod approved the Norwegian *Opgjøer*, in which the *intuitu fidei* doctrine of election is placed on a level with the doctrine of election taught in the Formula of Concord. How, in view of this fact, the

Ohio Synod will be able to accept the *Chicago* (Intersynodical) *Theses*, which explicitly reject the teaching that God elected us in view of faith, is hard to see.

It will be recalled that the Ohio and the Norwegian Synod both were members of the Synodical Conference before the predestination controversy. When the storm broke, about 1880, Ohio withdrew on account of doctrinal disagreement with Missouri, and the Norwegian Synod, a few years later, likewise left the Synodical Conference, declaring, however, that it was taking that step for reasons of expediency, hoping that in this manner it might be enabled more easily to compose the differences in its own ranks. Fraternal relations with the synods of the Synodical Conference were maintained by the Norwegian Synod until the latter merged with the United Church and the Hauge Synod to form one body. It was at that time that a number of members of the old Norwegian Synod, who for reasons of conscience refused to join the Merger, chose rather to perpetuate the body to which they had belonged, the Norwegian Synod, and joined the Synodical Conference, thus reestablishing its historical relations with this federation. Dr. Wm. Schmidt, favorably known in our circles as the author of *Aethelburga*, *Sieghardus*, etc., in reporting in the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* the convention under discussion, expresses the wish that soon the time may come when all conservative Lutheran synods will see eye to eye and, if possible, form one body. It is a wish which we cordially adopt as our own. We must not forget, however, that our great task is not to form mighty, imposing church-bodies, but to be faithful witnesses of the revealed truth.

Resolutions Effecting Merger between Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo.

For the sake of completeness we reprint, from the *Lutheran Church Herald*, the following resolutions which were adopted by the Ohio Synod at its recent meeting in Columbus: 1. "We are glad to find that the declarations of the Hon. Iowa Synod concerning its attitude toward the Scriptures, as adopted at its convention at Waverly, correctly express our position on the inspiration and the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures." 2. "We believe that Article II, Section I, of the proposed constitution, as adopted by the Joint Merger Commission, is the best available summary of these declarations for use in a synodical constitution." 3. "We take note of the fact that the Buffalo Synod has resolved not to enter the merger unless this section be retained in its present form." 4. "We recommend that the synod reaffirm its desire for organic union with the synods of Iowa and Buffalo and that the commissioners be reappointed and instructed to proceed with the work of effecting a merger as soon as possible on the basis of the constitution proposed by the Joint Merger Commission." 5. "We recommend that the forty-ninth convention of the Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States adjourn subject to the call of the general president and that every District shall elect its delegates to the first convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of America, the Districts to be represented at the said first convention by a number of delegates conforming to the rules of the new body."

MUELLER.

Program of the 1929 Copenhagen Lutheran World Convention.

The Lutheran press reports that the following subjects will be discussed at the Lutheran World Convention, which will convene next year at Copenhagen, beginning on June 26 and continuing for about ten days: "The Origin and Significance of Luther's Large and Small Catechisms." "The Duty of the Present Generation to Transmit Its Heritage of the Faith to the Next Generation." "The Faith and the Confession of the Church in the Light of Marburg and Augsburg." "The Distinctive Contribution of Lutheranism to Christendom." "How Should we Strive for an Inner Awakening of Our Church?" "The Lutheran Conception of the Relation between Christianity and the World." "The Lutheran Church and the Social Crisis." "How May the Inner Unity among the Lutheran Churches be Furthered?" "Report of the Executive Committee, with Suggestions for the Future Organization of the World Convention." (Closed session.) "Helping Our Needy Brethren in the Faith (Diaspora, etc.)." "The Chief Problems for Lutheran Missionary Work that Arise from the Present Situation."

The trouble with these conventions is that those arranging them take unity of faith for granted instead of first establishing it. It is no secret that there are glaring disagreements on really fundamental matters between the men who will attend this convention. For instance, theologians accepting the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures will be sitting beside men vigorously denying such inspiration. Why not make the removal of these disagreements the objective? We do not wish to be understood as though we opposed "free conferences" called for the settling of doctrinal disputes. The history of the Lutheran Church shows that such conferences have often resulted in great blessings. But when World Conferences are called where fundamental disagreements are kept in the background or treated as non-existent, we cannot but regard such a course as an unscriptural procedure.

In a Garbled Form.—The *Lutheran Church Herald*, writing editorially on the statement given to the press by the Convention of Lutheran Editors at Columbus, O., points out that this appeared "in a garbled form in the Columbus papers to suit the political leanings of the papers." It declares: "The first topic considered by the editors was: 'What Attitude Should Our Lutheran Church-papers Take toward a Catholic Candidate for the Presidency of the United States?' It being noised about that this was under consideration, a representative of the press was on hand for 'news.' In a weak moment the editors promised a statement for the next day, which was given with the specific instructions that either all or nothing be printed. It appeared in a garbled form in the Columbus papers to suit the political leanings of the papers. The consensus of opinion among the editors was that the church press should not advocate the election of special candidates, but at the same time would not consent to be muzzled on any ecclesiastical, religious, moral, or theological question to enlighten its constituency."

The statement given to the press reads in part: "... that the

Lutheran Church believes in the separation of Church and State and that in no previous election in the United States has the Lutheran press given space to political issues. The Lutherans agree to the principle contained in the Constitution that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.' In itself the right of the member of any Church or even a man who is no member of any Church to be a candidate is held inviolable; but public agitation, which has become current throughout the nation, calls for enlightenment of our constituents in the present campaign relative to the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the seat of civil and spiritual powers, that is, the Church and the State."

The statement quoted the paper read at the convention in part as follows: ". . . It becomes the duty of our church-papers to give to their readers reliable information as to the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards the authority of the worldly government and especially the precious liberties guaranteed by our Constitution; to counteract misinformation and to correct false and misleading innuendos, statements, and impressions."

"The church-papers, however, will not and need not advise their readers how to vote, but must leave this to their own intelligent and conscientious judgment."

MUELLER.

"The Methodist Gospel." — "American Methodists of all colors and countries will be interested in the celebration of the 150th anniversary of Wesley Chapel, City Road, London. This will occur on All Saints' Day, November 1, 1928. John Wesley first preached in that chapel November 1, 1778. From that location began the work of the evangelist, who with a burning heart, 'strangely warmed,' went into the world to preach what later proved to be 'the Methodist gospel.' This chapel, now called Wesley's Chapel, City Road, London, is the mother of over 100,000 Methodist churches throughout the world. This means that on the average, every day during these 150 years, two new Methodist preaching-places have been opened somewhere in the world. Verily, let all true hearts exclaim, 'What hath God wrought!'

"When Wesley died, there were not more than 200,000 people called Methodists. However, that is not a small number for a leader to attract about him in a lifetime of a little over eighty years. Now the Methodist people number nearly 40,000,000. They are to be found in all parts of the world, while one of the great bodies, the Methodist Episcopal Church, is rapidly becoming a world-wide communion. There is reason for the celebration of the 150th anniversary at City Road. All Methodists throughout the world should join in it by offering some form of prayer during the day and calling the history of the great movement to memory midst thanksgiving to Almighty God." — *Western Christ. Advocate*, September 20, 1928.

What is the Methodist gospel? The teaching Wesley stressed was not the Gospel of forgiveness of sins through faith. He stressed the article of sanctification. This article needs to be stressed. It needed it particularly in those days. But it must never be placed above or

even beside the article of justification by faith in importance. Wesley did that. He spoke of sanctification as "the grand *depositum*" which God had lodged with the people called "Methodists." For the sake of propagating this chiefly, "he appears to have raised them up." (H. K. Carroll.) — Another teaching for which Wesleyan Methodism stands is Arminianism. The stressing of sanctification and Arminianism usually goes hand in hand. Methodists ascribe a varying degree of freedom of the will in spiritual matters to man. Wesley was willing to be classed as an Arminian and says: "We believe that at the moment of Adam's fall he no longer possessed a freedom of the will, but that God, when by His own free grace He gave him and his descendants the promise of a Savior, restored to mankind a free will and the power to accept the offered salvation." (Guenther, *Pop. Sym.*, p. 164.) In the Twenty-five Articles of Religion drawn up by Wesley for the American Methodists the *total* corruption of the nature of man is denied, and man is held only "to be very far gone from original righteousness." Those 100,000 churches are dedicated to the idea that natural man can cooperate in his conversion and salvation. The *Western Christian Advocate* of June 2, 1927, speaks of men "who go out deliberately intending to find Christ. They have something in their souls that draws them towards Him, as though they had the metal in their own hearts that was responding to the far-away magnet which witnesses to the drawing power of Jesus Christ." In common with the rest of the Reformed divisions the Methodists do not believe in the power of the means of grace and as their own special gospel have introduced emotionalism. Art. XVII declares "that baptism is a *sign* of regeneration" and Art. XVIII that "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." The means of grace are consequently not held in high esteem among the Methodists. For instance, last year, according to an official organ of their Church, not even one out of six children born in the congregations was brought forward to baptism in the Missouri Conference of the M. E. Church, South. Instead of the means of grace instituted by God they have devised "means of grace" of their own, made effective through stirring up all manner of spiritual and unspiritual emotions. The *Advocate* of October 11 enumerates the prayer-meeting, the class-meeting, the camp-meeting, and revival, and since these are falling into desuetude, "the present-day youth is making his own fountains; the human spirit has creative genius; out of his own nature comes the solution of his own problems." Youth has "created the Epworth League institute." — The heart of the Gospel is justification by faith. The Methodist Confession has this fine article (IX): "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." There is an echo of what Wesley heard and experienced on that memorable evening when he drank in the words of Luther's *Introduction to the Epistle to the Romans*. Whenever in some of these 100,000 churches this article is read and

expounded, the Gospel finds utterance. But if the preacher has just been expounding Arminianism, the full need of the Gospel has been obscured to many. And those who feel their need are being told not to look to the means of grace, the only vehicle for bringing forgiveness of sins to the sinner. Justification by faith is held up to his view, but the way to obtain it is blocked. Art. II also gives expression to the glorious truth of the Gospel: "The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, so that two whole and perfect natures — that is to say, the Godhead and manhood — were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men." Whenever we hear that in one of these 100,000 churches the doctrine of the person and work of Christ is preached in its purity, we note it "midst thanksgiving to Almighty God." And when we note the intrusion of the Methodist gospel into the true Gospel, Arminianism and the rejection of the means of grace derogating from the merit of Christ and keeping it from the sinner, our hearts are filled with grief and resentment. And, worst of all, in how many of these 100,000 churches is Art. II still held? The *Presbyterian* states that "the *Christian Advocates* are undertaking to control Methodism in the interest of Modernism." The *Methodist League for Faith and Life* confirms that statement: "We believe the Christian Church is facing the greatest crisis it has confronted in 1,500 years. — Modernism has totally rejected this historic Christian foundation." And the *Western Christian Advocate* of October 6, 1927, strongly confirms that statement. It printed this contribution by Bishop Locke: "'My friend,' said a rather frank, but well-informed man of progressive doctrinal thinking, 'your orthodox position seems to me untenable, if not unreasonable. I cannot subscribe to your belief in an inspired Bible, nor a blood atonement, nor to the physical resurrection of Jesus, nor to the deityship of Jesus, and I am not at all secure in my confidence in the immortality of the soul; although I believe firmly that God is good and that He is a living, heavenly Father.' 'My brother,' replied the sincere man of rather old-fashioned theological views, 'in this world of mysteries presided over by a God of infinite personality, it is a wonder that infinitesimal finites like ourselves can understand anything. We should, not any of us, become too dogmatic concerning our beliefs and should cultivate receptive minds. I confidently believe in all of these great doctrines which are puzzling you; but if we differ from each other in our conscientious interpretations, each of us will be judged according to our honesty and sincerity. Every man will have his own Christ, and if he follows his holy ideal and conforms his life to the truths and spirit of Jesus, he will doubtless share in the salvation which Jesus brought to a dying world, even if he is not sure whether Jesus had one human parent or two or is uncertain regarding the mysteries of the atonement or whether he thinks everything in the Holy Bible is

wholly inspired.' 'And John answered Him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name, and he followeth us not; and we forbade him because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a miracle in My name that can lightly speak evil of Me. For he that is not against us is on our part.' WHEN WILL IT HAPPEN?" Does this belong to the Methodist gospel which the *Advocate* aims to spread among the 100,000 churches of Methodism and for the spread of which it calls for thanksgiving to Almighty God? E.

The Roman Church in Politics. — Bishop Warren A. Candler of the Methodist Church recently uttered some words which precisely state the reason why Protestants are filled with alarm whenever there is mention of Roman ascendancy in our political life. He said: "The trouble with the Roman Catholic Church is that it seeks to be both a church and a political party. Its arrogant claim of being the only true Christian Church might be treated with indifference; but when its head asserts political and civil authority, a position is assumed which cannot be allowed any Church whatever. If it must assume such a position, its members must not complain if it is met with political opposition not offered to any other Church. If it were willing to take its place as a Church along with all other churches, it would be improper to meet it with any other attitude than that with which we meet all other churches; but it is not willing to be only a Church. Putting itself into a class by itself by its political animus, it must take all that such improper attitude makes inevitable. It cannot claim the political exemption of a Church while it asserts political claims as well as churchly prerogatives."

The Bible of Mr. H. G. Wells. — Speaking of one of the recent books of H. G. Wells, in which he advocates the ancient doctrine of Hindu philosophy on the Nirvana, the *Presbyterian* says: "Since the publication of *Outlines of History* Mr. Wells has dealt very generously with philosophy and more authoritatively with theology — that science which intimidates more modest men. Now he comes forth as the prophet of a new dispensation. It is not an original idea, for others have formulated a creed in which individual hopes and identity will be lost in the haze of a final Nirvana. Mr. Wells has brought down a new suit of clothes with which he has robed this antiquated figure, dressing him as if he were a modern. It is so strange that these new cults are not recognized as the revived ghosts of a depleted system that has been weighed in the balances and found wanting. Yet there are thousands of readers who will imagine that in *The Open Conspiracy* they have discovered the gateway of the kingdom of God. There is a Book more eagerly bought to-day than in any former period, and it is pathetic to see men attempt to displace it with the puerile production of their infantile minds. In it is an answer to all the pressing questions of life, whether about this world or the world to come." MUELLER.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

As usual, the bimonthly theological journal of our brethren in Germany *Schrift und Bekenntnis*, in its number for July and August, offers valuable material. The first article, which will be concluded in the next issue, treats of modern dialectic theology (*Zur weiteren Kenntnis der dialektischen Theologie*), examining some writings of Gogarten. The next brings a report on "The Youngest Lutheran Free Church in Europe," the Free Church of the brethren in Finland. Ten congregations, we are told, have united to form a church-body. In the section superscribed "Miscellaneous" we find parts of valuable articles reprinted from other journals. Finally, there are remarks on contemporaneous religious happenings and some book reviews. Price of the journal: M. 2.50 for half a year.

The Ohio Synod, so the church-papers state, now numbers 900 pastors. In its five institutions of higher learning there are 1,500 students. 130 missionaries are serving in the home mission fields. In India its mission among the Telugus numbers 4,000 converts.

The *Christian Century* complains of the "emergence" of three new Baptist theological seminaries of a fundamentalist type, apprehending that they will do much harm. These three are the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary at Chicago, the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, and the Western Baptist Theological Seminary in Portland, Oreg. The *Watchman-Examiner* says that to the group of out-right conservative seminaries must be added the Kansas City Seminary. To the extent that these schools defend the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures we can rejoice in their existence.

Concerning the work of the Baptists among the colored population in our country we read in an exchange: "The National Baptist Convention, composed of colored people, was formed in 1886. It has 22,037 churches and 3,253,733 church-members." Our contemporary continues: "Most of the colored Baptists hold tenaciously to the time-honored doctrines and polity of the Baptists." The emotionalism fostered by many Baptist churches, especially in the South, has a great appeal for the colored man and, we may add, for many whites as well.

A new future seems in prospect for the state of Liberia in Africa. One of our exchanges informs us that it has been discovered that "rubber can be raised there at a profit. A large American concern has leased for ninety-nine years a total acreage of one million for the purpose of developing rubber plantations. Some 350,000 men—practically the whole man-power of the republic—will eventually be on the pay-roll of the company. Adjustments are being made in the type of mission-work, increases are being made in the number of schools, plans are being made for industrial and agricultural training, and other plans are under way for community and health betterment—all with a view to meeting this new economic situation that will doubtless reshape the country."

The *Lutheran* of October 11 is an anniversary number, commemorating the founding of the U. L. C. ten years ago. One thought occurring repeatedly in it is that the Lutherans of America ought to present a united front in order to do the Lord's work more effectively. Yea and amen! But will outward union without true inward unity help matters?

The extent to which modern Jews are turning away, not merely from Jesus the Savior, but from their own traditional religion as well, is appalling. Witness what, according to the *N. L. C. B.*, a writer in the *Juedische Rundschau*, the official organ of the Zionist movement in Germany, has to say: "One of the causes that led up to the Zionist movement is the realization that we are without a religion. The majority of intelligent modern Jews, actuated by a powerful impulse of national spirit, turned our thoughts to Palestine because we realized that our belief in

a personal God has vanished. We hope to find in Palestine a new valuation, arising from a deep, new sense of national life, to fill up the void of our inner life and being. This shall replace that which hitherto we have designated as religion, the relation of an individual man to a personal God, which has proved a mere phase of development of mankind. Once we acknowledge this absence of religion, we may no longer dally with obsolete forms. All efforts in that direction would come to naught and expose its unreality. Therefore at the national festivities of Palestine all religious observances are out of place."

BOOK REVIEW.

The Christian. By *William Dallmann, D.D.* 221 pages, 4×5¾. \$1.25. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This third, enlarged edition of Dr. Dallmann's *The Christian* is a beautiful gift edition. But, however beautiful the binding may be, the real beauty of this book is in its contents. On 213 pages of a pocket-size edition the author has 130—not articles, not essays, not sketches, but Dallmannian presentations of great religious truths. In his own peculiar way—simple, pointed language, short sentences, many Scripture-verses and Scripture-references, many examples from history and from the experiences of men in all walks of life, fearless confessing of the truth, blunt and yet kind and tender-hearted, hating sin, but loving the sinner—Dr. Dallmann has given us a *vade-mecum* of unusual merit, which can be used in many ways: it may be read at the morning and evening devotional hour of the family, pondered over by the shut-ins and those on the sick-bed, consulted when in doubt, used for the strengthening of faith in tribulation, made a daily companion when riding to and fro on the street-cars, taken along on one's travels, studied as a review of Christian doctrine and its practical application to daily life, given to inquirers concerning religious truth or as an answer to him who asks what the Lutheran Church teaches, or presented to a friend for the enlightenment of his spiritual life. The preacher will find in *The Christian* a wealth of sermon material. We agree with Professor Graebner, who wrote the brief introduction, that "it is a wonderful book."

J. H. C. F.

Der Kleine Katechismus Luthers eine herrliche Gabe der Reformation. By *Prof. J. T. Mueller, Th.D.* 40 pages. 20 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This tract—originally a paper read by Professor Mueller at a meeting of one of our synodical Districts—deserves special mention just at this time, for we are getting ready to celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of Luther's Small Catechism. Let us not neglect this opportunity to teach our Lutheran people anew what a gem our Small Catechism is, and let us also not neglect the opportunity to put this little book into the hands of many who are not members of our Lutheran Church in order that they may become acquainted with the teachings of our Church and thus with the true Christian religion. Pastors will find much material in Professor Mueller's tract, for he treats "1) The History of the Catechism, 2) The Contents, 3) Its Use, 4) Its Blessing." But why should we

not give the whole tract into the hands of our people? The Catechism is one of those things which many of us have had since our childhood days, but which in the course of years we fail duly to appreciate. Luther's words to his little son may well be recalled. When the boy joyfully reported to his father, "*Jetzt habe ich den Katechismus ausgelernt*," Luther said to him, "*Durchgelernt wohl; ausgelernt nie*." J. H. C. F.

Proceedings of the Eastern District of the Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States. 61 pages. 40 cts.—**South Wisconsin District.** 88 pages. \$1.15.—**Atlantic District.** 63 pages, 40 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The proceedings of the Eastern District contain an English doctrinal essay by Pastor Geo. Luecke on "The Proper Use of the Doctrine of the Church." The report of the South Wisconsin District is unusually large; the proceedings proper cover 96 pages and contain an English doctrinal paper on "The Activities of a Lutheran Pastor" by Pastor O. F. Engelbrecht. On 88 pages, annexed to the report proper, there is a German essay on "The History of the South Wisconsin District" by Prof. Otto F. Hattstaedt, who presents valuable historical material also for those who are not members of his District. At the meeting of the Atlantic District the Rev. Prof. Wm. Arndt read an essay on "The Sacrificial Death of Christ," which has been printed in the proceedings of that District.

J. H. C. F.

Primary and Junior Hymnal. 30 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The compiler of these seventy-eight hymns gives the reason for putting this book on the market by saying in the preface: "Teachers of Primary and Junior grades in both day- and Sunday-schools have for some time felt the need of a hymnal to put in the hands of the children. In the day-school it is difficult to induce children of the second or third grades to buy a church hymnal, because it contains many more hymns than the pupils will use for some time to come and because the book will be worn out before the child gets to the higher grades. Teachers who select their hymns from various sources will find one collection convenient. The need is also felt in Sunday-schools in which the Primary Department meets separately. The hymns being selected from different sources, extreme vigilance is demanded as to doctrine and the needs of childhood. The *Primary and Junior Hymnal* was brought into being to fill the need. Children have in this book an inexpensive hymnal, which they may use in school for the opening exercises and for the memorizing of hymns; teachers have a compact collection of hymns to fill the ordinary needs in primary grades in day-school and Sunday-school; parents have a book that will materially improve the interest in daily devotion if the children can be induced to sing the morning or evening hymns." We have two hymnals, our church hymnal, to which, a number of years ago, our *Sunday-school Hymnal* was added. We doubt the advisability of adding a third hymnal. Before new hymnals or new catechisms are introduced into the Church, one should think twice, and then again a few times. J. H. C. F.

Glory to God in the Highest! A Children's Vesper Service for Christmas Eve. Compiled by *M. G. Webber*. 16 pages. Single copy, 6 cts.; dozen, 60 cts.; hundred copies, \$4.50. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Those who are looking for a somewhat different Christmas program, and yet one that is not at variance with the Christian and Lutheran idea of Christmas, the celebration of the festival of the Christ-child, will be glad to use this new program, of which the compiler, M. G. Webber, says: "This Vesper Service, arranged for parochial and Sunday-schools, is based upon the Vesper Service found in the *Ev. Luth. Hymn-book*. A sufficient number of hymns are inserted, and recitations are indicated at various places. This order of service tells the Christmas-story in its proper order, beginning with references to the Messianic prophecies, their fulfilment, the watching shepherds, the angels, the visit of the shepherds to Bethlehem, and a statement of the purpose of our Lord's incarnation."

J. H. C. F.

Scripture-Text Calendar. Concordia Edition, 1929. — **Bibeltex-Kalender.** Gedanken zur taeglichen Betrachtung, 1929. Single copy, 30 cts.; 5 copies, \$1.40; 50 copies, \$9; 100 copies, \$17. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

These are two beautiful calendars — one German, the other English — to be hung on the walls of Christian homes. Both contain a beautiful colored frontispiece and a large colored picture on the calendar page for each month, with a description of the picture. On the calendar page of both is printed a small calendar of the previous and the following month. Both give the calendar days in large, heavy type, with a short Bible-text added, the same texts being used in both editions. On both, the Sundays and church holidays are printed in red ink; both give the phases of the moon. The German calendar records the miracles and parables of the Lord; the English calendar indicates the vestment colors to be used during the church-year and gives a general weather forecast and the constellation of the heavens. We doubt whether a general weather forecast for the entire year serves any purpose at all, since our official weather forecasters cannot even from day to day forecast the weather and therefore often disappoint us. The reading-matter given under the caption "The Heavens" ought to be omitted or revised in the edition of 1930. It serves no good purpose to make such a statement as: "Venus is nearly a twin sister of the earth in size and mass, and many astronomers are of the opinion beings similar to those on earth could live on this near neighbor," or: "Directly overhead about 8.30 or 9.00 P. M., view the world's new north-pole star — not now, but 11,500 years hence." Such a statement as: "The sun is 91,347,000 miles from the earth" also serves no definite purpose. We have read that the sun is only 20,000,000 miles from the earth. Of course, the small difference of 71,000,000 miles does not mean much to the "scientists." We suggest that such statements be omitted from our calendar until the scientists themselves have arrived at a better understanding and at an agreement. If in the mean time they feel that they must give some figures, why not add three or six or nine more ciphers? It will take only a little more space and a little more printers' ink. In spite of all this we should like to see the calendar in the homes of our people.

J. H. C. F.

Day by Day with Jesus. A Calendar for Family and Private Devotions.. Edited by *Prof. W. H. T. Dau, D.D.* Single copy, 60 cts.; dozen, \$6.00. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York and Chicago.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

In every Christian home some portion of the Bible ought to be read every day. The purpose of the calendar *Day by Day with Jesus* is to encourage such daily Bible-reading and, as its title implies, to keep the Christian with Jesus, who says: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," which words are printed in large type on the face of the calendar. For each day a short Scripture-text together with an exposition of it and either a short prayer, some hymn verse, or a brief illustration is given; longer Scripture readings for morning and evening meditations are indicated. Over 120 contributors have been at work on this calendar, and the reputation of its editor, Dr. Dau, as well as that of its contributors, vouches for the Biblical soundness of the material presented. We believe that pastors are doing their people a real service by introducing this calendar into the homes of their congregations. J. H. C. F.

Christmas All the Year. By *Theo. Graebner*. 96 pages, $7 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$. Single copy, 30 cts.; dozen, \$3.00, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.)

Heart's Treasure. By *Theo. Graebner*. 128 pages, $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$. Single copy, 50 cts.; dozen, \$4.80, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.)

Pilgrims on the Narrow Way. The Catechism in Story. By *Theo. Graebner*. 64 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. Single copy, 30 cts.; dozen, \$3.00, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.)

Ring Bells of Christmas. Collected by *Uncle Timothy*. 64 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. Single copy, 30 cts.; dozen, \$3.00, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.)

Famous Missionary Pioneers. By *W. G. Polack*. 64 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. 30 cts.; dozen, \$3.00, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.)

The Hero of the Forest. By *W. G. Polack*. 64 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. 30 cts.; per dozen, \$3.00, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.)

Among the Hereros in Africa. By *H. Beiderbecke*. 64 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. 30 cts.; dozen, \$3.00, not prepaid. (Ernst Kaufmann, New York.) — Order above-mentioned books from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

These seven small, inexpensive books have been published to be given as Christmas-presents. The first is a collection of stories, such as *Christmas All the Year*, *When the Car Broke Down*, *Phil's First Day Back of the Counter*, *Her Easter Lily*. The second book is much like the first; it contains such stories as *Heart's Treasure* (a Christmas-story), *The Man from Lost Mountain*, *The Stairway that Led to Success*, "I Am the Resurrection and the Life," "I Was an Hungred, and Ye Gave Me Meat," *The Gingerbread Men*, *The Girl and the Dictionary*. The third book is a collection of more than forty stories, which illustrate the teachings of the

Catechism. Since Luther wrote his Catechism four hundred years ago, this book is put on the market at this time to help celebrate this event. The book also contains many pictures. The fourth book, by "Uncle Timothy" (Prof. Theo. Graebner), is a combined collection of stories and poems. The fifth book gives sketches on John Eliot, David Brainerd, Samson Occum, Hans Poulse Egede, Christian Frederick Schwartz, J. Hudson Taylor, Adoniram Judson, Guido Fridolin Verbeck, Cyrus Hamlin. The sixth book tells of David Brainerd's work among the Indians. The seventh book relates the experiences of a Lutheran pastor (Pastor Beiderbecke) as missionary in Africa. All the books make wholesome reading and should be given the preference by far to many other books that might be picked up from a promiscuous lot found on the book tables of the stores.

J. H. C. F.

Communion Liturgy. By *Karl Haase*. Published by Karl Haase, Seward, Nebr. 30 cts. Order from the author or from Concordia Publishing House.

Every organist knows how important it is that the notes for the various parts of the liturgical service be not scattered, so that they have to be looked for here and there, but be at hand in collected form. Professor Haase here offers a publication which contains the notes and the text for both the German and the English Communion liturgy and the ordinary Sunday service. Since the price is low and the print excellent, I have no doubt that Professor Haase's offering will soon be very popular.

Evangelisch-Lutherischer Hausfreund-Kalender, 1929. Begrundet von *Dr. O. Willkomm*; Herausgeber: *Martin Willkomm*, Berlin-Zehlendorf. 45. Jahrgang. 18 cts. (Verlag und Druck von Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Sachsen.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Just as in previous years, we heartily recommend this *Hausfreund* almanac to all our readers who are able to read German. It contains an abundance of interesting, edifying, and instructive reading-matter. Articles which especially attracted the reviewer's attention are those on the Small Catechism of Dr. Luther, on the sainted Mr. Lamprecht, and on the beautiful German hymn *Gott des Himmels und der Erden*, the value of the last-named article being enhanced by pictures of Rudolph Schaefer. God bless editors and readers of this little work, which offers such wholesome and palatable food!

From the Publishing House of *A. Deichert (Dr. W. Scholl)*, *Koenigstrasse, Leipzig*, we have received the following publications for review (may be ordered through Concordia Publishing House):—

1. **Grundriss der Geschichte des Lebens Jesu.** Von *Theo. Zahn*. M. 3.60; bound, M. 5.

That old age is not an absolute hindrance to literary activity is strikingly illustrated by the case of Dr. Theo. Zahn, who, in spite of his ninety years, is still producing books of solid merit and great importance for New Testament students. We are inclined to value these works all the more highly since they reflect, not the hasty judgment of a neophyte critic,

but the ripe views of a scholar, who throughout a long and industrious life has pondered the questions on which he writes and now can speak with authority, as far as that is humanly possible. His *Outlines of the History of the Life of Christ* embraces 82 pages and hence is not a thick book, but it is surprising what a multitude of historical and critical questions are touched on in that comparatively small compass. After a brief introduction the material is presented in five sections. The first section treats of political and religious conditions in Palestine at the time when Jesus was born; the second, of the descent, birth, and childhood of Jesus; the third, of His public ministry up to the time of the imprisonment of John the Baptist; the fourth, of the year of grace for Galilee (the great Galilean ministry of Jesus); the fifth, of the last half-year in the earthly life of Jesus. This little work is especially valuable for busy ministers, whose many duties will not permit them to read more extensive and elaborate treatises on this great subject. Zahn, it ought to be mentioned, is known not only as a scholar of immense learning, but as a conservative theologian. We regret that he does not believe the holy writings to be free from all contradictions and to be inspired in every detail.

2. *Grundriss der Einleitung in das Neue Testament.* Von Theo. Zahn.
M. 5; bound, M. 6.50.

Dr. Zahn is probably better known through his isagogical studies with reference to the New Testament than through any other publications of his. In the course of three years, 1897—1899, appeared his famous *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, which made his name a household word in all theological schools. Of hardly less importance were his studies relating to the history of the New Testament Canon. The work under consideration offers on 120 pages a sufficiently comprehensive sketch of Dr. Zahn's views on the authorship and occasion of the various New Testament books. He proceeds chronologically. After a few introductory paragraphs he at once goes *medias in res* and discusses the Epistle of James, which he regards as the oldest book in our New Testament. Next, the three letters of Paul which Zahn considers the oldest Pauline writings are discussed: Galatians; I. and II. Thessalonians. The order in which the other New Testament books are treated is the following: I. and II. Corinthians; Romans; the letters of the first Roman captivity, namely, Colossians, Philippians, Ephesians, Philemon; the three last epistles of Paul, that is, the pastoral letters; the epistles of Peter, Jude, and the Epistle to the Hebrews; the first three gospels and Acts and the writings of St. John. Among recent publications giving an introduction to the New Testament writings this work easily deserves first place. In spite of the brevity of treatment which the nature of the work imposed, one will find that here all the great historical questions relating to the origin of our New Testament books are touched on. Zahn throughout is conservative. To mention a few details, he regards Rom. 15 and 16 to be integral parts of the letter to the congregation in Rome. Hebrews, he thinks, was written by Barnabas. The gospels are treated quite exhaustively. The two-source hypothesis, so much in favor nowadays, is rejected by him. The reviewer cannot agree with all the opinions of Zahn, but is glad to testify that the venerable Doctor's discussion has been of immense value to him.

Index.

- Anticlericalism in Mexico, p. 344.
 Apologetic Material, 80.
 "Baptists Necessary," 179; Work of the Baptists in Russia, 54.
 Beatitudes, Are they Law or Gospel? 362.
 Bible and Science, 309; Books about the Bible, 220; Anti-Bible Societies, 278; The Bible Itself Is the Real Issue, 81; Dr. Cadman's View of the Bible, 306; Difficulties Connected with the Translation of the Bible into the Tongues of Primitive Peoples, 55. The Bible of Mr. H. G. Wells, 377.
 Book Review, 29. 58. 89. 122. 156. 183. 223. 248. 282. 313. 347. 379.
 Call, the Divine, 78.
 Catechism, Luther's Small, Retranslated, 25.
 Chastity, Growing Disregard of the Old Standards, 278.
 China, No Indemnity to be Demanded from, 220.
 Church: Is the Christian Church Invisible? 149; The "Interdenominational" Church Passes, 303; The National Church of the Air, 119.
 Church and State, Separation of, 310.
 Christ, The Work of, 33; Blessing of the Work of Christ, 65.
 Civilization, Ape-Bones and the Cradle of, 57.
 College, A National Communist, 242.
 Compliment, Who Is to Blame for the? 150.
 Confession and the Confessional, 144; An Inadequate Confession of Faith, 305; The Confession of Faith of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, 151.
 Controversy, A Plea for, 46.
 Convention, A Historical, 371. Program of the 1929 Copenhagen Lutheran World Convention, 373.
Conversio Reiterata, 219; Conversion, "The Element of Human Freedom" in, 218.
 Curtis-Reed Bill Now before Congress, 154.
 Degrees and Teaching Ability, 85.
 Divorce, Concerning, 302.
 Doctrine, Growth in, Is Not Change of Doctrine—a Confounding of Terms, 82.
 Dr. Lang the Next Archbishop of Canterbury? 342.
 Editor Complimented, 110.
 Education, Elementary Christian, 49.
 Episcopalians Revising Their *Prayer-book*, 304.
 Evangelism, Letter-writing, 180.
 Evolution as Taught at the University, 307; Opposition to Evolution Increasing, 308; What does the Layman Know Concerning Evolution? 87; Evolutionist, Methodist, Take Notice, 53.
 Explanation, A Wrong, 51.
 Faith, Of, 129. 161.
 Foreword, 1.
 Forgiveness, Full, 257. 289. 321. 353.
 Form, In a Garbled, 373.
 Formula of Concord, Historical Significance of, 101. 135. 169. 201. 231. 262.
 Franklin, Benjamin, and Promiscuous Prayer, 345.
 Fundamentalism, Has It Accomplished Anything? 110.
 Gen. 12, 3b Translated Correctly in the Authorized Version? 111.
 Glimpses from the Editor's Window, 28. 88. 120. 154. 182. 247. 281. 311. 345. 378.
 Godliness in Business, 277.
 Hesperopithecus Haroldcookii Again, 120.
 Hittites, the Ancient, 247.
 Hymn, A "Vulgar," 56; Icelandic Passion Hymns Translated into Chinese, 274.
 Immigration, Lutheran, Will It be Restricted? 109.
 Imputation, The, 97.
 Iowa Synod Reaffirms Position, 301.
 John 17, 21 Once More, 48.
 Kingdom of God, Strange Ideas of the, 82.
 Lausanne Adventure, 112; The Lutherans at Lausanne, 2. 37.
 Lecture Administered by the Wrong Party, 115.
 Liberalism, The Bane of, 152.
 Lodges: Freemasons Trying to Unite, 311; The God of Odd-Fellowship, 294; A Presbyterian on the Evils of the Lodge, 279.
 Lottery, What Constitutes a? 302.
 Luther and Missions, 46; The Conversation of Luther, 338; Why was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing before the Diet? 14; Why Luther Failed [?] as the Reformer, 26.

- Lutheran Brotherhoods, American Federation of, 26.
- Lutheran Church Responsible for the Divisions in the Visible Church? 109.
- Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism, 79.
- Means of Grace, 193. 225.
- Merger between Ohio, Iowa, and Buffalo, 372.
- Methodist Gospel, 374.
- Minister as Thinker and Student, 273.
- Missionary Approach to the Heathen, 104; A Missionary concerning Wrong Tendencies of Protestant Work in China, 310; Missionaries Widely Misrepresented, 27; The First Lutheran Missionaries in India, 340.
- Modernists; Let Them be Honest, 238.
- Moses Weak in Arithmetic? 299.
- Movies and Religion, 86.
- Offering Form, 49.
- Pacifism, Just Wars and War Lust, 244.
- Pedagogy, Modern Religious, and the Lutheran Principle of Worship, 67.
- Pilgrim Fathers, What We Do Not Owe the, 152.
- Politics, When Church Enters, 341.
- Prejudice, Power of, 241.
- Presbyterian Church, Crisis in, 220; Is the *Presbyterian* Presbyterian? 113.
- Proselytism, Rom. 16, 17 and Modern Ideas of, 53.
- Radicals, How Some, Teach, 222.
- Rites, Pagan Origins of, 116.
- Rome: The Catholic Doctrine of Intention, 239; The Catholic Religion Not the Christian Religion, 275. 276; The Greatest Danger Threatening from Rome, 343; The Late Encyclical of the Pope, 115; The Pope's Temporal Power, 86; Superstition Still Fostered by Rome, 241; The Vatican and the White House, 153; Rome's Triumph in Bavaria, 84; Education in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States during the Past Year, 84; Some Roman Catholic Fallacies, 342; Crypto-Romanism in the Church of England, 221. Roman Church in Politics, 377.
- Russian Church Recognizes the Soviet Government, 86.
- Sandt, Retirement of Dr., 78.
- Seminary, Andover, a Warning Example, 237; The Princeton Seminary Situation, 305.
- Schleiermacher, Revolt against, 52.
- Schmidt, Dr. F. A., Deceased, 237.
- Schools: Bible Schools, 50; Parochial Schools in the Old-school Presbyterian Church, 1846—1870, 50; Are We up to Date with Our Christian Day-schools? 337.
- Studies in First Peter, 72.
- Suicides, Fifty Thousand, 310.
- Sunday-school Times* Opposes Unionism, 79.
- Sunday's Revival Talk, Samples of, 118.
- Time, A Waste of Precious, 246.
- Tongue of Gold, 277.
- Unbelief, Must the Church Surrender to? 325.
- Union without Unity, 304.
- Unionism Truly Makes Strange Bedfellows, 47; A Defense of Unionism Refuted, 178; A Nursery for Unionism, 338.
- Unitarian Hymnal for the American Youth, 221; Reasons for Unitarian Decreases, 83; Unitarianism and Freemasonry, 117; Neo-Unitarianism in Ulster, 181.
- Videant Consules*, etc., 114.
- Voltaire's, The Horrors of, Last Days, 173. 208.
- What's Wrong? 337.
- Wisdom, Sample of Modern, 55.
- Woman, Christianity and, 243.
- Young People and the Christian Home, 54.